

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignina 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/686,626	10/12/2000	James A. Satchell JR.	TPP31333	6147	
7.	590 06/11/2003				
Stevens, Davis, Miller & Mosher			EXAM	EXAMINER	
1615 L St., N.W., Suite 850 Washington, DC 20036			GARLAND,	STEVEN R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2125		
		DATE MAILED: 06/11/2003	DATE MAILED: 06/11/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/686,626	SATCHELL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Steven R Garland	2125
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 28 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to aviginal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amo	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension
fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	ce later than three months after the mail FR 1.704(b).	ling date of the final rejection, even if
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF</li> </ol>	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•	
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancelli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:	reconsideration has been consi	dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: 1-12.		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>31-41,60-74,76-130</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	it(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·
10. Other:	150.50	CADD
5n1, de ///	LEO PI SUPERVISORY PA	TENT EXAMINER
STEVEN GARLAND	TECHNOLOGY	CENTER 2100
S. Patent and Trademark Office		





Continuation of 2. NOTE: For example proposed claim 114 would include new limitations in regards to assembling and webstites not previously considered and consideration of a rejection under 35 U.S.c> 112 2nd paragraph would have to be given to at least claim 102 because of the dependency change.